DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 146 UD 027 081

AUTHOR Jones, Vern; Dunn, Cory
TITLE A Systematic Approach for Responsibly and Effectively Managing the Disruptive Behavior of "At-Risk" Students.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; Classroom Techniques; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *High Risk Students; Intervention; Program Descriptions; Student Needs; *Systems Approach; *Teacher Response
IDENTIFIERS Oregon (Albany)

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes a systems approach for dealing with the disruptive behavior of at-risk students based on the principle that there is a shared responsibility among all school staff and that the methods employed should respond to the emotional and skill needs of the students. The approach has the following key components: (1) support by school board policies and administrative guidelines; (2) teacher assessment of appropriate classroom management and of instructional methods for working with these students, along with the responsibility for using them; (3) assistance available to teachers to examine interventions and to find alternatives; (4) a clear and effectively communicated school-wide student management system, with procedures for dealing with student problems; and (5) outside consultation, utilization of community resources, and referral to special education programs. Two figures present forms and policies used in the Greater Albany Public Schools (Oregon). A list of 34 references is provided. (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

9/19/89

ED311146

A Systematic Approach for Responsibly and Effectively Managing the Disruptive Behavior of "At-Risk" Students

Vern Jones, Ph.D.
Professor of Teacher Education
Lewis and Clark College
Portland, Oregon
and
Cory Dunn
Coordinator, Behavior Management Consultation Program
Linn-Benton Educational Service District
Albany, Oregon

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Vern Jones
Lewis and Clark College
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD 027 081

A Systematic Approach for Responsibly Managing the Disruptive and Irresponsible Behavior of At-Risk Students

Several recent trends have once again highlighted the importance of educators developing effective, responsible methods for responding to disruptive student behavior. The Regular Education Initiative has provided impetus for the concept that at least some students who receive special education services may be better served by continued placement in regular school classrooms. At the same time, educators have been bombarded with information on the increasing number of at-risk students in American schools. The term "at risk" has become a popular term for describing students who are not receiving special education services but who, due to social/emotional problems, learning problems, lack of family support or other factors, are less likely to have positive school experiences and are more likely to experience failure and drop out of school. While educators are concerned about all of these at- risk students, teachers and administrators are most concerned about those whose failure is associated with high levels of disruptive behavior. Educators are often caught in the difficult position of wanting to provide services to these students and yet feeling frustration because these students are highly disruptive to the learning of other students.

Because school personnel will, during the next decade, be faced with increasing numbers of at-risk students, educators need to develop ways of working with disruptive, at-risk students that provide these students with the social and academic learning they desperately need while at the same time teaching them that they will be held

accountable for their actions. A balance must be struck between teachers' responsibility for providing productive learning environments for all students and teachers' rights to teach. While order is a necessary prerequisite to effective teaching and learning, the method in which order is established is equally important (Jones, in press).

In their study of 50 elementary schools in London, Mortimore and Sammons (1987) found that, "...much of the variation among schools in their effects on students' progress and development is accounted for by differences in school policies and practices" (p.6). The systems approach presented here provides a model for developing policies related to the issue of disruptive student behavior. It is also a method educators can employ to create school environments in which students and staff can be taught to develop responsibility by receiving encouragement for their positive behavior and being held accountable for their irresponsible behavior.

Disruptive students frequently evoke in adults responses that tend to limit their patience and creativity in managing and instructing these students. Unlike students with visual impairments or learning disabilities who may evoke empathy, curiosity and other sensitive responses, students who consistently or aggressively act out often evoke feelings of fear, anger, annoyance, frustration and confusion. These feelings are, quite understandably, often associated with the desire to have the student removed from the setting for which the adult is responsible and to have someone else assume responsibility for the student. Behavior problem students are very much like a hot potatoe; whoever has responsibility for them feels uncomfortable and wishes to toss the problem to someone else.

Unfortunately, this response runs counter to what is most needed by students with behavior problems and may actually reinforce the students' emotional problems.

These students have often experienced adults as uncaring, inconsistent and rejecting. They have learned to manipulate environments in which adults have failed to work together. These students are often "political experts" and are adept at manipulating a system in which adults try to pass the responsibility of managing these students to someone else. Behavior problem students frequently have social perception deficits and lack skills in understanding the effects their behavior has on others and understanding the consequences of their behavior. Instead, they often have an external locus of control and blame external factors for their problems. Finally, these students often lack appropriate solving problems skills. They may feel angry and victimized about their school failure but are unable or unwilling to express this and generate solutions for altering the situation. In their re-analysis of the High School and Beyond Study, Wehlage and Rutter (1986) found that "marginal students" viewed school discipline policies as ineffective and unfair. These students also believed that teachers were uninterested in them or whether they remained in school.

It is our assumption that in order to respond most effectively to acting out and withdrawn students who are at risk for school failure, school policies and staff behavior must: (1) create a system of shared responsibility for these students, and (2) incorportate methods that respond to these students' emotional and skill deficits. Our review of the research and extensive experience working with schools to develop school-wide student management plans and programs for individual behavior problem students indicates that there are nine key components to an effective and responsible systems approach for managing student behavior in school settings.

A Continuum of Services, Systems Approach

The continuum of services concept has been developed by the authors as a method for assisting schools in meeting their professional and legal obligations for responding to student behavior problems. Studies on school organization and leadership that are associated with positive student behavior indicate that schools must be careful not to focus exclusive attention on controlling student behavior (Duke, 1986). Schools that foster productive student behavior are characterized by their clear rules for student conduct (Stedman, 1985), their collegiality among staff members and pervasive caring for students (Anderson, 1985, Bickel and Qualls, 1980), effective instruction, and a focus on providing positive reinforcement and options for students (Mortimore and Sammons, 1987; Rutter et al., 1979). The continuum of services approach provides schools with a structure for responding to disruptive student behavior that incorporates the factors associated with schools that encourage positive student behavior. This approach also focuses on developing clear policies that assist both educators and students in taking greater resonsibility for their behavior.

The continuum of services approaches incorporates nine basic components discussed in the remainder of this article. In order to be most effective, the components should be implemented in a step-by-step fashion. However, several components may be implemented simultaneously.

Insert Figure 1 Here

Component 1: School policies for responding to irresponsible and/or unproductive student behavior will be most effective when they are supported by clear school board policies and administrative regulations.

Because a continuum of services approach requires that a variety of individuals be actively involved in assisting students with behavior problems, it is likely to meet with some resistence. Our experience clearly indicates that this model will be dramatically more effective if it receives support and legitimacy at the highest possible administrative level. For example, a school board or a local educational service district board can draft policy that supports a systematic, continuum of services approach. This central administrative support places principals in a very different position than they would be in without this support. Instead of being the instigators of a policy that asks all teachers to be responsible for working effectively with at-risk and behavior problem students, the principal is in the position of involving the school staff in implementing school board policy. This will enhance staff/administrator relationships - a factor that has been shown to be associated with more effective responses to behavior problem students (Anderson,1985; Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1986; Metz; 1978). Figure 1 presents a school board policy established in Albany, Oregon. This policy provides general guidelines concerning the shared responsibility for preventing and responding to disruptive student behavior.

Component 2: The teacher must initially assess his/her classroom management and instructional methods to determine whether they are consistent with best accepted practice and the needs of the student(s) involved.

Researchers and educators are becoming increasingly aware of the relationship

between teachers' instructional and classroom management decisions and student achievement and behavior. Recent material both in this country (Cangelosi, 1988; Curwin & Mendler, 1988; Johnson & Johnson, 1987 and Jones & Jones, in press) and in Britain (McManus, in press; Mongon & Hart, in press) has focused on the importance of understanding students' perspectives and meeting students' personal and learning needs as prerequisites to effective teaching with discouraged, "at-risk" students

We have found that it is useful to create a checklist against which teachers can evaluate the degree to which they have performed their responsibility in creating a positive, productive learning environment. Despite the considerable research conducted on effective management and instruction, it is not possible to develop a definitive list concerning "best accepted practice" for motivating and managing students. Instead, teachers and administrators in a building or district must work cooperatively to develop a list that is acceptable to all staff. Ideally this list will be consistent with the district's inservice training component and professional competencies expected by teachers in the district. The list needs to reflect teacher responsibility for implementing a variety of classroom management and instructional strategies that have been found to be associated with high student achievement and positive student behavior. (Brophy, 1987a, 1987b; Doyle, I986; Emmer, et al., 1984; Johnson and Johnson, 1987; Jones and Jones, 1986). Figure 2 presents a list the authors have developed to assist teachers in assessing their use of preventive classroom management and instructional methods.

Some teachers and administrators express concern when presented with the suggestion that changes in teacher behavior can significantly and even dramatically improve student behavior and achievement. The most common concern relates to the concept that time and energy committed to incorporating methods that meet the needs

of at-risk students will limit the educational experience available for higher achieving students. We believe the research supports the fact that virtually all methods that benefit at-risk students also benefit a wide range of other students- including the most able. For example, efforts to increase cooperative learning and individual goal-setting are not only beneficial to at-risk students but provide high achieving students with important life-long skills while increasing their current academic achievement. Indeed, recent studies indicate that employers want employees who possess a broad range of skills beyond basic knowledge. These skills include (1) knowing how to learn, (2) listening and oral communication skills, (3) creative thinking and problem solving, (4) goal setting, motivation and personal/career development, and (5) skill in working in groups, including interpersonal skills, negotiation and teamwork (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration). These are skills that are developed by teachers incorporating a wider range of instructional strategies that more actively involve students in group work, decision making and goal setting - some of the very methods that work most effectively with at-risk students.

Insert Figure 2 Here

Component 3: The teacher has a responsiblity to employ behavior change methods aimed at altering the student's behavior.

Because it involves skills and interventions not directly related to instruction, some teachers, especially at the secondary level, may balk at the inclusion of this component. Some teachers firmly believe that their role is to teach content rather than assist students in developing more productive behavior. We believe that while a teacher's primary function involves developing and implementing activities that facilitate content mastery, teachers are also responsible for the initial efforts at managing student behavior and this includes a limited use of methods to assist

students in learning or demonstrating productive behavior. Indeed, studies (Finlayson and Loughran, 1978; Galloway and Goodwin, 1987; Hawkins, Doueck, and Lishner, 1988; Purkey, 1984, Reynolds, 1976; Wu, Pink, Crain and Moles, 1982) indicate that student misbehavior may be higher when schools place too much emphasis on control and place most discipline issues immediately into the hands of administrators. Interestingly at least seven states require that teachers employ and document some form of corrective intervention before a student can be referred for special education identification. Finally, research (Evertson and Emmer, 1982; Jones, 1986) and the authors' experiences indicate that when teachers implement proactive classroom management methods they will minimize situations when corrective interventions are needed. Furthermore, an impressive body of research-supported methods that teachers can implement in the classroom are now available (Becker, 1986; Englander, 1986; Jones, 1986; Jones and Jones, 1986).

There are several key ingredients or skills that are associated with effectively utilizing methods for responding to irresponsible, disruptive student behavior. These include:

1) developing positive personal relationships with students that indicate high teacher expectations and concern for students,
2) closely monitoring students' academic performance and behavior,
3) initialy using brief, nondisruptive interventions,
4) handling conflicts calmly and avoiding engaging in power struggles,
5) clarifying students' choices and the fact that students are expected to be responsible for their behavior and the consequences associated with their actions,

6) using effective listening skills to help students identify the problem and develop insight, and

7) negotiating behavioral or acacemic agreements with students.

When teacher and school staff develop these basic skills, interventions for responding to disruptive student behavior have a much better chance of being successful and requiring a reasonable amount of teacher time.

Our experience demonstrates that in responding to disruptive student behavior interventions will be most effective when they follow a sequence from methods involving the greatest amount of student reponsibility, initiative and internal locus of control to methods more controlled by adults. A heirarchy of methods following this formula might involve:

1) problem solving,

2) student self-monitoring,

3) student behavior contracts and

4) a structured discipline response with an individual student.

Teachers are not expected to employ every one of these interventions with a behavior problem student. Instead, teachers need to be able document that they have attempted one or more of these methods for several weeks and kept some record of the results. If one method is ineffective, a teacher should be expected to attempt one additional method. It is important that these attempts be clearly documented - including multiple copies of the forms on which they are recorded. This data is important because it can be utilized by other school staff at a different stage in the process of responding to the student's behavior. This type of record keeping also demonstrates that teachers have responsibly fulfilled their professional role and serves to protect them in dealings with parents and students.

Component 4: Teachers benefit from receiving assistance in examining their interventions with behavior problem students and developing an alternative approach to assisting such students.

Because many teachers have recieved limited training in working with at-risk and behavior problems students, and because these students often evoke in teachers feeling of frustration and inadequacy, resources need to be available to assist professionals who are having difficulty implementing required interventions suggested in either components two or three. These resources may include: (1) inservice opportunities to improve teachers' skills in classroom management and diversified instructional methods, (2) observation by building, district or contracted professionals to monitor teachers' classroom management behavior and suggest methods for increasing positive student behavior, or (3) the creation of teacher assistance teams which provide a forum for colleagues to provide teachers with ideas for working with students who are experiencing behavior or academic difficulties (Chalfant, 1983; Chalfant, VanDusen Pysh, and Moultrie, 1979). Many schools now employ staff development specialists, a portion of whose job responsibilities involve assisting teachers and other school staff in improving their skills for working with difficult to instruct or manage students. Similarly, many school psychologists have adjusted their time commitments to reduce the amount of testing and increase their availability for providing teachers with classroom observations and the associated specific ideas for motivating and managing at-risk students.

Component 5: Teachers will be more effective in helping students develop responsible behavior when the school has a clearly written and effectively communicated school-wide student management system.

Research on school organization that influences student behavior has

consistently pointed to the importance of clearly stated school rules and consequences for irresponsible behavior (Duke, 1986). The most effective programs, however, are those that go beyond a focus on controlling students and attempt to examine the quality of relationships and instruction in the building and the options that are provided to students who are experiencing difficulties.

Our experiences in working with numerous schoolwide student management plans indicate a consistent pattern of problems with these plans:

1) the plans almost always focus on discipline at the expense of effective instruction, school climate and classroom management,
2) there is often no statement of the classroom teacher's role in managing behavior problems and the minimum of instructional and behavior change interventions that must be implemented by the teacher prior to a student being being referred to the office;
3) especially at the secondary level, policies frequently fail to describe positive reinforcements associated with desirable student behavior,
4) clear, sequential consequences for misbehavior are missing.
5) the focus is often on punishment rather than on problem solving and student advocacy.
6) programs often fail to incorporate clear goal setting and accountability through data collection and analysis.

Our experience and reading of the research indicates that a school-wide student management program will be most effective when it includes:

1) a major emphasis on examining the types and possible causes of student misbehavior,

2) a focus on staff development in both classroom management and instruction as an intervention for improving student behavior,

3) a consideration of school climate as a factor influencing student behavior and learning and

4) an emphasis on problem solving and instructing students in developing appropriate, responsible behaviors as a key factor in responding to inappropriate student behavior.

An effective school-wide student management program provides students, teachers, administrators and parents with a clear outline of what behaviors are acceptable, which are unacceptalble and the consequences that will occur on those occasions when students choose to behave inappropriately. Students can be more aware of the choices they are making, choose to alter their behavior in light of impending consequences and take greater responsibility for their behavior when there exists a clearly delineated sequence of consequences. This type of response is similar to what currently exists in many states regarding violations of motor vehicle laws. Drivers know that a designated number of moving violations will lead to designated consequences and that ultimalely the driver can have his/her license evoked. More serious driving offenses such as driving while intoxicated are associated with more serious consequences and permit fewer opportunities for violations before the most serious consequence is invoked. As in the case of driving, students should be required to pass a test concerning the school rules and the consequences for rule violation. In order to insure maximum clarity consistency and fairness, these expectations, rules and consequences should also be written in the parent-student handbook as well as in the teacher handbook.

A school-wide student management plan will be most effective when it provides students with opportunities for developing new skills for behaving responsibly and productively in the school setting. When students have serious difficulties with reading or math, educators do not place them in time-out settings or Saturday schools as a means to improve their skills. Instead students are placed in Chapter I or other reading and study skill centers in order to develop the needed skills. Similarly, students who are behaving inappropriately in school are lacking skills. Consequences for misbehaving should require students to examine their behavior and to consider optional methods for responding. This can be accomplished by having students complete problem solving forms that involve them in examining the effects their behavior had on themselves and others in the school environment and develop alternative behaviors they could engage in when confronted with similar situations in the future. The authors have incorporated this process into a number of school student management plans in an effort to make detentions and other disciplinary responses more instructional for students. Students know that whenever they behave irresponsibly they must satisfactorily complete an educational task that helps them examine their behavior. They also know that this task is not merely a condition for meeting their responsibility for the consequence of their misbehavior but that it is also a way to help them learn to develop important new skills. Without exception when this process has been implemented, student attitudes about and attendance at detentions has improved dramatically.

A key ingredient in creating an effective school-wide student management program is to involve teachers throughout the process. While it is tempting to find a well-written policy, place it in teachers' boxes and mandate its implementation, it is likely that this will lead to an almost immediate sabotaging of the policy. Teachers who

are involved in defining a problem and developing solutions are much more likely to employ the solutions.

Component 6: The effective student management plan includes a procudure for staff to examine serious, persistent student problem behaviors and develop structured intervention plans.

Whenever a student has received several office referrals it is desirable to have a staffing at which teachers meet to develop a specific plan for assisting the youngster in having a more successful school experience. While most buildings employ staffings, these are seldom built into the school-wide student management plan as a systematic method for intervening in an attempt to alter the school environment in order to assist the student. We believe that one effective way to insure that staffings take on this flavor is to indicate within the the school-wide student management plan the specific stage at which a staffing will be held. Ideally, each staffing should lead to a specific intervention plan involving several school staff. We call these Personalized Education Plans (PEPs). Unlike IEPs required for students identified as eligible for special education services, a PEP is not a legal document nor does it involve special education services. However, like IEPs, PEPs are very specific plans developed to respond to the unique educational needs of a student. The development of such plans can be expedited by employing a structured approach to staffings. We have found that an effective process includes five steps:

1) focusing on one or two specific student behaviors that need to change in order for the student to have a successful and/or continuing school experience,
2) determining specific interventions to bring about these changes,
3) assigning responsibility to staff for implementing each intervention,

4) determining the data to be collected for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of interventions, and

5) setting a date to review the program.

Component 7: Outside consultation should be provided when a student continues to have behavioral difficulties despite components one through five being employed.

School staff are often stretched to their limits and may not always be able to objectively assess attempts to assist students whose behavior has consistently caused the staff frustration and anger. In addition, while their concern and efforts may be commendable, school staff may lack skill in developing alternative interventions with students whose behavior is difficult to manage or extremely withdrawn. Because both of these factors may lead to school staff referring or excluding students who may be able to function in a regular school environment, assistance should be provided to staff once it has been documented that the staff has followed district guidelines for assisting behavior problems students. Assistance can be provided by a variety of sources. District or regional service district school psychologists or behavioral specialists can be called in to review the situation and make recommendations. Our experience suggests that it is desirable to have the consultant spend a sizeable portion of a school day observing the behavior problem student in classroom settings. The consultant will also need to examine the students' school file and review PEP plans and the associated data. Finally, it is often useful for the consultant to interview the student. Following this evaluation the consultant can meet with the teachers involved and make recommendations concerning any additional interventions that appear likely to assist the student in improving his/her behavior. The consultant might make suggestions concerning classroom management and instruction, modifications in the school-wide student management plan, an individualized contract for the student or additional

school counseling services. The consultant may also indicate that the existing program appears to be a well-designed and reasonable response to the student's behavior and may suggest that the staff consider instigating a referral for special education services.

Compontent 8: Utilizing Community Resources

A significant number of at risk children experience emotional problems and difficulties outside of school that warrent interventions from community agencies. It is important for educators to realize that the term "at- risk children" has different meanings depending on whether it is being utilized by educators or mental health specialists. In general, the term implies the threat of impending negative consequences for a child. As referred to earlier in this article, educational definitions of at risk suggest a student may potentially drop out of a school program entirely. Within community agencies utilizing clinical definitions, "at risk" suggests the potential injury to a child of an emotional or mental nature that would require clinical intervention to remediate. While many students may meet criteria in both groups, there are important distinctions between them that have significant implications. One important difference is that the educational definitions imply educational interventions and clinical definitions imply clinical interventions. It is, therefore, important for educators and social service agency staff to be aware of the variation in definitions and the implications for services.

If educators assume, for example, a clinical definition of the term, they may assume that there is little they can to in the way of interventions with the student. In reality there are a wide range of instructional approaches for at- risk students available to educators which are unavailable if clinical defintions are assumed for the term at -risk. On the other hand, due to the educational nature of their primary responsibility and the training of their staff, educational institutions have a limited ability to respond to the clinical needs that some students present in the school setting. It is therefore

important for school systems to understand and be able to access the community resources that exist for the at risk student.

A concept designed to respond to the needs of these students and the institutions which serve them is interagency cooperation and collaboration. More specifically, the Youth Service Team (YST) concept provides a format for promoting more productive service to at-risk students. These teams provide for networking and liaison between schools, social service agencies, law enforcement, the juvenile department and other community resources. School personel are often in a prime position to become aware of a variety of student needs which increasingly seem to be beyond the scope of appropriate intervention in the educational system. By staffing students among a variety of agency representatives, information is shared and alternatives may be developed. This process is effective in preventing a duplication of services as well as catching children who might otherwise go without services altogether.

Interagency collaboration and cooperation provides for a more comprehensive view and coordinated planning for at- risk children and their families. It also provides for the appropriate delivery of services and promotes a much more responsible model for those children who have the greatest need for being held accountable for their actions.

Component 9: Referral for special education services.

One important benefit of employing a systematic continuum of services approach to responding to unproductive student behavior is that if it becomes necessary to refer the student for special education identification, much of the most important groundwork will already have been completed. Research (Smith, Frank and Snider, 1984) indicates that when making eligibility decisions regarding seriously emotionally disturbed or behavior disordered students, the most frequently missing data involves

information on the student's actual behavior and interventions that have been implemented to alter the inappropriate behavior. At least seven states currently require that such information be available prior to a student being identified as behavior disordered or seriously emotionally disturbed, and several other states recommend that this process be followed (Jones and Waksman, 1985). A continuum of services approach insures that appropriate prior interventions will already have been made. Since this dramatically expedites referrals to special education, it helps to alleviate a common teacher concern regarding the delays in processing such referrals.

Conclusion

The increasing number of at-risk students is likely to insure that educators will continue to be challenged with the problem of effectively responding to disruptive or irresponsible student behavior. Likewise increased public awareness of students' rights may well intensify the pressure on schools to insure that students have been given every reasonable opportunity for and assistance in developing appropriate and productive school behavior and have been provided legal due process where access to their right to an education is restricted.

Fortunately, research in applied classroom management methods has expanded dramatically during the last decade and teachers have available to them a range of specific, proven strategies for increasing positive student behavior. Additionally, a variety of methods have been developed for assisting students who continue to act irresponsibly even in responsible classroom and school environments where teachers consistently employ proven classroom organization, management and instructional methods.

As discussed in this article, educators have begun to develop approaches to managing persistent irresponsible student behavior that delineate and clarify the responsibilities of all parties involved. This systematic, continuum of services approach provides students with multiple opportunities to receive assistance from school personnnel and responds appropriately to the developmental needs of behavior problems students by providing them with a sense of the personal concern of others, clear structure, the opportunity to learn new skills and a sense of control over their environment. At the same time, it requires teachers, administrators and specialists to share responsibility for assisting these youngsters while at the same time insuring that no one will be saddled with total responsibility for responding to the behavior of students with serious problems. When school personnel employ a continuum of services, systems approach to managing unproductive and irresponsible student behavior, educators are modeling the responsible behavior they expect of students.

Figure 1

GREATER ALBANY PUBLIC SCHOOLS - BOARD POLICIES

Pupil Personnel

5200: Student Discipline

The Greater Albany Public School District recognizes its responsibility to students to provide a climate for their education which contributes to the orderly pursuit of learning. It also recognizes that all persons involved with the schools carry a responsibility to contribute to establishing and maintaining that orderly climate. There has been, however, a running debate regarding the students' role in maintaining discipline in schools. We believe the students' role is to fully contribute to the maintenance of the safe and orderly climate which is so necessary if all are to profit from the high quality education opportunities of our schools.

Establishing the disciplined educational climate requires also that we achieve the proper balance between protection of the teachers' right to teach and the students' right to learn how to correct their unproductive and inappropriate behavior under the guidance of caring school staff and parents. Teachers' rights to teach also encompass parents' rights to expect their children to be taught in a safe and encouraging environment. It also includes the students' rights to have their learning not disrupted by other students' inappropriate behavior.

Because teachers must deal most frequently and most directly with student behavior, they must plan to meet that part of their responsibilities. Teachers will continue to be the first to become aware when an imbalance occurs between their right to teach and the students' right to learn to correct inappropriate behavior. If this moment comes to the teacher's attention without forethought, there is a tendency to balance extreme student behavior with extreme teacher behavior. Pre-planning helps avoid extreme responses.

The growing emphasis on settling differences through the curt system makes it increasingly necessary that the expectations we have for student behavior be made clear. The question "What behavior is expected of students?" must be answered in a way that recognizes students' right to learn how to correct inappropriate behavior.

Those experienced with dealing with student discipline issues have been able to extract some principles of prevention from their case studies. Those principles include:

1. Sharing behavior expectations with students and the reasons for those expectations. This includes sharing an understanding of why the expectations are reasonable.

2. Involved adults consistently applying a student behavior management procedure.

3. Communication the consequences of inappropriate behavior.

4. Adjusting students' instructional programs to the appropriate level of difficulty whenever possible.

5. Maintaining a positive classroom climate and modeling positive peer and teacher-student relationships.

6. Providing positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior and negative/positive reinforcement for inappropriate behavior.

7. Developing a cooperative working relationship among the classroom teachers, school principal and parents to enable consistency throughout a young person's day.

The goal sought through use of these principles is that students will learn to make appropriate choices and develop the self-discipline necessary for independence beyond imposed authority. It is also incumbent upon the school district to protect the rights of all involved in disciplinary action to protect the students' constitutional rights. It must be remembered that students learn responsible behavior through practice.

Parents and students are expected to recognize their responsibilities and legal obligations in observing the attendance requirements and in adherence to the rules and regulations of the District and its schools. School/parent joint responsibility for appropriate behavior is outlined below:

AR 5200-A-1: Procedures for Student Behavior Management Program

The following progression of steps is to be used in Albany schools as Student Behavior Management Programs are developed and implemented. Under extreme conditions, however, the concern for safety understandably overrides these procedures.

At the beginning of each school year, all classroom teachers will develop, post in their rooms and teach their students the classroom rules for behavior they expect students under their supervision to follow. Since students are learning, rules for behavior are to be taught and reviewed in appropriate settings so students have the opportunity to learn them.* The classroom behavior management program should stress positive student behavior. Rules for behavior will be approved by the building principal to assure consistency with building and district behavior management plans.

The teacher's student management program should include the instructional and classroom management methods teachers will use in dealing with both appropriate and inappropriate student behavior. It is imperative that the teacher's classroom management methods be implemented early in the corrective process and before calling upon resources available beyond the teacher/classroom.

If, after a sufficient time period, the classroom teacher's corrective classroom methods are deemed insufficient to correct a problem, the counsel of other teachers, counselor and the principal within the building should be sought.

If the corrective methods are deemed insufficient after implementation of consultation advice by the classroom teacher and the principal, the student would be referred for the building-level student behavior management program and the principal would appoint a case worker.

At the beginning of each school year principals will review the building-level student behavior management plan with teachers, students and parents. The building-level student behavior management plan will be the vehicle through which corrective instruction can be provided to students referred from the classroom and through which the teachers' rights to teach will be supported. This plan is to be provided in writing to staff, students and parents. Appropriate reviews with these persons would be in order and records kept of reviews. The management plan should emphasize positive student behaviors.

> It is imperative that building-level intervention procedures be implemented before calling upon district support services for more than consultation.

If, after implementation and a sufficient trial period, it is felt that building-level corrective methods are deemed insufficient to correct a problem, the building principal should arrange for district consultation resources.

If, after consultation with district-level staff, implementation of consultation advice and a reasonable time period, it is felt that the methods applied at the building level are insufficient to correct the behavior and the behavior is considered to be one which might lead to special education placement rather than further disciplinary action, the building principal will follow the district,s referral process to obtain assistance from the staff team composed of a building administrator or designee, involved teachers of a student for placement in a special education program. If eligible for special education, the multi-disciplinary staff team would develop an I.E.P. and determine placement and programming. The building-level special education staff will provide and coordinate the service.

If the complete evaluation indicated in the preceding paragraph results in a recommendation of placement in a building-level special education program, placement proceeds. If the recommendation is for placement is a self-contained program, the recommendations from the evaluation center staff shall be reviewed with the Special Programs Coordinator.

If the student is placed in a self-contained program and after implementation and a sufficient trial period it appears that the placement is not appropriate, alternative placements shall be considered.

Figure 2 **Interventions Prior to Removing a Student From the Classroom or Referring a Student for Special Education Services**

Level 1: Classroom Management and Instruction	Yes	No
1.1 The teacher interacts positively with the student		
1.2 The teacher communicates high expectations to the student		
1.3 The student is actively involved with peers either through cooperative learning or peer tutoring		
1.4 Classroom procedures are taught to students and this student demonstrates an understanding of the procedures		
1.5 There is a consistent routine in the classroom that is understood by the student		
1.6 The student's instructional program is appropriate to his/her academic needs		
1.7 The students has been involved in some form of academic goal setting and self-recording		
1.8 Rules for managing student behavior are posted in the classroom		
1.9 Rules are appropriate, succinct, stated positively and all inclusive		
1.10 Consequences for inappropriate behavior are clear to all students		
1.11 Consequences are appropriate, fair and implemented consistently		
1.12 The students demonstrates she/he understands the rules and consequences		
1.13 The teacher has met privately with the student to discuss the problem and jointly develop a plan both parties agree to implement in order to assist the student		

Level 2: Individual Behavior Program		
2.1 An academic and/or behavior program has been developed and consistently implemented and corresponding data collected for at least four weeks		
2.2. An alternative program was implemented if the original plan (2.1) proved to be ineffective		

REFERENCES

Anderson, C. (1985). The investigation of school climate. In G. Austin and H. Garber (Eds.), Research on exemplary schools. New York: Academic Press.

Becker, W. (1986). Applied psychology for teachers: A behavioral cognitive approach. Palo Alto, CA: Science Research Associates.

Bickel, F., and Qualls, R. (1980). The impact of school climate on suspension rates in the Jefferson County Public Schools. The Urban Review, 12, 79-86.

Brophy, J. (April, 1987a). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington D.C.

Brophy, J. (1987b). Synthesis of research on strategies for motivating students to learn. Educational Leadership, 45, 40-48.

Chalfant, J. (1983). Identifying LD students: Guidelines for decision making. Eric Document ED 258390, Alexandria, VA.

Chalfant, J., VanDusen Pysh, M. and Moultrie, R. (1979). Teacher assistance teams: A model for within-building problem solving. Learning Disability Quarterly, 2, 85-96.

Cangelosi, J. (1988). Classroom management strategies: Gaining and maintaining students' cooperation. New York: Longman.

Curwin, R., and Mendler, A. (1988). Discipline with dignity. Reston, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Duke, D. (1986). School organization, leadership, and student behavior. Paper commissioned by the Office of Educational Research and Information, United States Department of Education.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., Sanford, J., Clements, B., and Worsham, M. (1984). Classroom management for secondary teachers. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Englander, M. (1986). Stratagies for classroom discipline. New York: Praeger.

Evertson, C., and Emmer, E. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the school year in junior high school classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 485-498.

Finlayson, D. and Loughran, J. (1978). Pupils perceptions in high and low delinquency schools, Education Research, 18, 138-145.

Galloway, D., and Goodwin, C. (1987). The education of disturbing children. London: Longmans.

Gottredson, G., and Gottfredson, D. (1985). Victimization in schools. New York: Plenum Press.

Hawkins, D., Doueck, H., and Lishner, D. (1988). Changing teaching practices in mainstream classrooms to improve bonding and behavior of low achievers. American Educational Research Journal, 25, 31-50.

Johnson, D., and Johnson, R. (1987). Learning together and alone: Cooperative competetive and individualistic learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Jones, V. (1986, April). A model for pre- and in-service training in comprehensive classroom management. Paper presented at the 1986 American Educational Research Association conference, San Francisco, CA.

Jones, V. (in press). The value of control in classrooms. Debates in Education.

Jones, V., and Jones, L. (1990). Comprehensive classroom management. (3rd Ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Jones, V., and Waksman, S. (1985). A suggested procedure for the identification of and provision of services to seriously emotionally disturbed students: Technical assistance paper 5. Salem, OR: State Department of Education.

McManus, R. (in press). Troublesome behaviour in the classroom: A teacher's survival guide. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Metz, M. (1978). Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Mongon, D., and Hart, S. (in press). Improving classroom behaviour: Making a difference. London: Cassell PLC.

Mortimore, P. and Sammons, P. (1987). New evidence on effective elementary schools. Educational Leadership, 45, 4-8.

Purkey, S. (1984). School improvement: An analysis of an urban school district effective schools project. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.

Reynolds, D. (1976). Schools do make a difference. New Society, 37, 22-38.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Montimore, P., Ouston, J., and Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Smith, C., Frank, A., and Snider, B. (1984). School psychologists' and teachers' perceptions of data used in the identification of behaviorally disordered students. Behavioral Disorders, 10, 27-32.

Stedman, L. (1985). A new look at the effective schools literature. Urban Education, 20, 295-326.

Wehlage, G., and Rutter, R. (1986). Dropping out: How much do schools contribute to the problem? Teachers College Record, 87, 374-392.

Wu, S., Pink, W., Crain, R., and Moles, O. (1982). Student suspension: A critical reappraisal. The Urban Review, 14, 245-303.